Tapes: 055, 056

Transcript of Interview with Charles H. Stoddard

Conducted by James Muhn and Hanson Stuart

March 5, 1988

***Disclaimer**: The Bureau of Land Management Library does not verify the accuracy of the accounts by participants in the Oral History Project. Individual stories are voluntarily submitted and are placed in the Library's permanent collection. These histories are the personal recollections and perspectives of participating individuals and are not intended as a substitute for an official record of the federal government. Transcripts have not been edited and may contain errors.*

0625H

INTERVIEW WITH CHARLES H. STODDARD

This is an interview with Charles H. Stoddard, former Director of the Bureau of Land Management with James Muhn and Hanson Stuart on March 5, 1988.

This is an incomplete transcript of the interview. Portions of the interview were not transcribed.

HANS: You can see from this list of sidebar articles what we're trying to involve all of the programs in one way or another. We trying to get something submitted from all of our state offices and a bunch of field offices. We're trying to make a very readable popular version of the history. This is going to be a 200-page paperback book, it's going to all employees as well as outside. It's not what we'd call a scholarly history which is comprehensive and footnoted but more of an orientation to the Bureau. We are going to have a suggested readings at the end of each chapter where we can refer people in more detailed accounts. Why don't we have you start with our first question, why were selected as Director but I would like to start maybe a little before that where you recount where you went to school and your work experience before BLM.

STODDARD: Well, I graduated from the University of Michigan in Forestry in 1934 and got my Masters in 1938 with the Foundation Fellowship. I went to work for the Forest Service in a number of places on the watershed studies and learned that my education has been rather narrowly contrived by the forestry school. I was able to learn a good deal about soil conservation and economics and related disciplines by association of these watersheds specialists. Then I transferred {***fm***} these watershed surveys to the {***Inter-Bureau arg.***} [Agricultural?] economics in Milwaukee Wisconsin that was a regional office and I worked at that job until I went into the Navy during World War II. During that time, I worked with BIA,

spent a semester at the University of Wisconsin and Madison taking graduate courses under Professor George {***Wulliner***} and his understudy, Leonard {***Sollar***}.

HANS: During the time just before World War II?

STODDARD: After the War, I went to work for the Charles Lathrop Pack Forestry Foundation, and I made a number of special studies.

JIM: What was the purpose of this foundation, was it a private commercial forest?

STODDARD: No, it was a research foundation they granted money for scholarships. I did two special studies for them, it took a couple years each, one before the war and one after. Their work was to encourage, their objective was to encourage people to get into broader fields of resource management.

HANS: Sounds like that had a lot of shaping here.

STODDARD: Yes, it did because I got of forestry when syndrome. During the war, I collected I collected trees and shrubs, tree specimens, bark, wood, flowers, fruit and shipped them back to Harvard University. I had a friend there and he encouraged me to send boxes of this stuff and I ..... one tree I identified as a new species, which they named after me. The tropical .....

Try spelling that one! I was assigned to...I took over for a Marine Lieutenant for a 30-day leave. We were identifying the different trees, Mahogany, Teague [Teak?], it looked like they were close to it, but they didn't have the species so Harvard put the species identification on it, and that was a new one. Tom Gill was the head of Forestry Foundation, he was a forestry from Yale and he encouraged me to fight for the foundation grant which I did this was after the war. He was the one that sponsored into the ...?..... They say he was the Yale Forester,

but he was also the fiction author. He published a lot of magazine articles. You want to know some answers to some of these questions here.

HANS: Yes, why don't we just briefly go up to the time you were selected as Director, you served in the Bureau of Agricultural Economics?

STODDARD: Well I did this before the war and then after the war I got in to doing some consulting work with the Pect Foundation(?) with the ? and I took a lot of consulting jobs. Then Maryland offered me a job with the BLM Forestry, and I didn't want to come to Washington at the end of the Truman administration when I could see what was happening with the change in administration. So, I continued my work in Wisconsin and Minnesota and I picked up some knowledge of raising cattle by accident. I owned some land in northern Wisconsin, 320 acres, which I tried to prove that there are ways to practice by conservation multiple use. I raised cattle, we did a lot of ? timber selectively, I did work for other landowners, worked for the Minnesota Leg. [Legislation??] just enough jobs around to keep me busy. I got a lot of experience which I was able to use when I got into Interior. In 1955 offered me a job in resources for the future. I came to Washington in 1955, was on the staff of Resources for The Future for five years. Did three or four studies and half a dozen articles, journal articles and contributed to parts of several books. We got into a group of us who are planning for policies for the next administration. We felt that the Administration that was in office didn't carry on the tradition of conservation that had been begun by Teddy Roosevelt. There had been no revival of conservation new conservation movement.

HANS: What group was that that you worked with?

STODDARD: Well, this was just an informal group. We just had lunch once in a while, we were called the "Democratic Department of Interior and Exile" and I don't know if your present bosses will appreciate this but we couldn't see any hope with the Republicans in Office, so we prepared papers for certain Senators, Senators Humphry, Kennedy, Jim Murray and a lot of

mostly Democratic Senators, but people who weren't afraid to stake out a new set of policies or a new administration. Then in the summer of 1960, [***Artubal***] Cox, he called me, and he heard about this luncheon group that we had, and he asked me if I'd serve on Kennedy's conservation and Natural Resources Advisory. I told him I would, he said when are you going to come back, he called me in northern Wisconsin and I said I'd be back in a month, and he said to get in touch with me and we'll have some papers for you to do, in the meantime you can clean up some stuff. So, I worked up some draft papers for the Kennedy campaign. Then when Kennedy got elected, our friends Henry Reuss, a congressman from Milwaukee, a guy I went to school [with]. I was raised in Milwaukee by the way, he offered to introduce me to ? [Stewart Udall??] who was just appointed as Secretary of the Interior. So, we went in there in to Udall's office he wanted me to write out a draft on the policies that this administration should follow in the Natural Resources conservation field.

HANS: I'm interrupting, do you have these papers in the library or donated them?

STODDARD: I'll tell you what I have, just a penciled draft of the paper that I submitted to Udall around the first week of January of 1961. Then the ? saw and he invited me to join his staff and head his Resources program staff. I reported to work, I remember the date, Feb 2, 1961, and he said I had the job right off the bat. The President wants to issue a message on conservation. There are reasons for this, but we won't go in to all the details. The President of the friend of Tom Kimball of the National Wildlife Federation, Tom had been egging him to come over dedicate their new building which Kennedy did after January 20 soon after. So, I said what I got to do is to get somebody that knows water and somebody who knows minerals. I can handle the forestry, wildlife and all that stuff but when it gets into pollution, some of these other fields, I'm going to have to get some help. Who do you want he said? I want Henry {***Crawfield***} from the Resources of the Future, Henry was one my associate in this group. I got Henry over and we put together a draft for Kennedy and we took it over to the White House, they worked around it, and we finally got a good draft put together between the White House and ourselves

and Kennedy issued it on the 21st of February so that's only 17 days we had to put it together. There were no American enterprises ? or anything to prepare this transitional type of material.

JIM: But it was one chance in a million.

STODDARD: You had a chance to lay out what ought to be done, you know how everybody says they ought to do this, they ought to do that but we laid it out. What the goal objectives, the beginnings of the program that I was working for in BLM. Then we went to work on Resources Program Staff on Land and Water Conservation Staff, that was Rockefeller Comm. [Commissioner?] that recommended that something of this sort be done, so we worked on that, we worked on the new system of recreational lands. The National rec. [recreation?] the National Lake shore, wild rivers all these things. We laid out for leg. [legislative?] enactment by the Congress and they took a lot of time. We were working on strip mining; we went to coal mining in Kent. [Kentucky?] to see what could be done about strip mining .....??..... tragic. Then one day in 1963, it was about April 1963 Udall called me in to his office, we got along very well I might say, he said 'I'm going to surprise you, I want you to go in to BLM' and I said that's very thoughtful of you, but thank you, no thank you. He said 'why? you get a boost in pay and a boost in status' I said because I've known every Director of BLM since the organization was founded, everyone has gotten kicked out or gotten into a conflict, and I said I don't need that. Well, he said, 'go home and think about it' so I did, and the more I thought about the more convinced I was that I was right, and he was wrong. I had a memorandum which I said, there will be a major, knock down drag out within two years with some industry or pressure group that has its eye on BLM properties. I'd just as soon avoid that. Well, I didn't know it but Carver, my assistant secretary, was the one who was pushing me into this job because it would have gotten him off the hook. and Carver weren't getting along and I guess Carver thought that he and I would. But Carver was the man who didn't have the same goals and objectives that I did to put it kindly. What were your goals to BLM: (1) to convert the agency to a Land Resource Management agency for the land disposal agency, that's what my goal is.

JIM: Do you have any idea of why Blanstrum [Landstrom?] was forced out? We've asked a few people, and nobody was really aware, it's just an amazing story how a tiny office in the 5600 corridor with two people, one of which was Jim Parker. He remember one day (Blanstrum [Landstrom?] was there, too) he'd went in there and he'd asked them " phone calls.

HANS: And there was a new Director sitting there in the Director's office, and nobody knew what was going on. Of course, that director was you.

(Can't tell who's speaking, all interruptions and additions to what is being said. Will just type as I hear Bobby)

Blanstrum [Landstrom?] was still there.

Well, he definitely was gone for a couple of weeks, but he got a new job in the Secretary staff.

I really didn't know I just went on vacation.

NOT STODDARD: Here you just said that you were reluctant to take the job, that you were thoroughly convinced that the job just was not for you. What made you change your mind?

STODDARD: Well,

NOT STODDARD: So, he just sort of gave in to you he really wanted you to take the job.

STODDARD: Yes, he really did. He told me, "You've been on my team, you've done a good job, and I need you. (Cannot understand what is being said.)

NOT STODDARD: When you came in as director you said your goal was to make it a land management agency so how did you go about doing it. One of the things you mentioned at breakfast was, of course, starting to replace various program leads, trying to bring new blood, new ideas. Could you go into that a little bit again?

STODDARD: I had field experience, detailed experience, in other agencies in the government: Forest Service, associated with the Soil Conservation Service, the PAE and experience with the Conservation Organization so I had pretty good preparation for the job at hand. I had never worked for BLM, I considered that an advantage because I could look at it objectively what they were doing. I got into that job at the office after all the hue and cry, all of the celebrations and swearing me in and swearing out with old . I looked around for some maps they had in the way of land and nobody "Maps?! We don't have maps" But I found some old railroad maps from 1915. And there were no maps showing land ownership. So, I said, "There's our first job. We're going to take down and right away." "But we might get in trouble with Congress," everybody said. I said, "Why would we get into trouble with Congress?" They didn't give me a good reason. So, I said, "We start with maps, then we go from there. We see what we've got, get us our inventory. 'If you're going to run a business, you've got to know what you have on your shelf.'" So, they went ahead and gave the instructions out to the field and of course the maps came in but I forgot to tell them to get it all on the same scale. So, they got a good set of maps worked out.

NOT STODDARD: Some inventories had to have been done before your time. Do you have a new angle on that?

STODDARD: An inventory of the productivity had been done. sort of like a soil survey in terms that carrying capacity, but I've

forgotten the details now. But it was an attempt to quality in range [management?] because BLM was essentially a range management organization. And so that's where the emphasis was at the time. But that's the only thing I recall. There may have been some individual studies in some places.

NOT STODDARD: At the discretion of a District Manager?

STODDARD: Or somebody came along and said, "I've got a problem." And there was some studying done on that problem. What I'm saying is that the need became inevitable, we needed something broader in terms of goals, criteria to making decisions. This became very evident as I stated in the paper that you received. When Professor Shipman, who had been hired by Hawkman before I got to the Bureau (Hawkman is a good man, you should talk to him) he went to work for MacDonald Douglas. Hawkman was the Land Records man which went well with Irving's background and interest. Shipman took a cursory examination of the Bureau's structure and its operations of business and concluded that I had to set some goals and objectives because he couldn't tailor the bureau unless it had some objective in mind and that seemed very evident during operations. I told him, "You expect me to whip up out of thin air. He said just about, ya,. I don't like the way this damn Bureau is peddling off all its land to real estate business. I have my opinion about real estate’s salesmen, and it’s not very good. When you get something figured out, let me know. About two weeks later, I let him know that what we wanted to be was a public land agency, which was what the name implied. But we had to recognize the fact that not all BLM lands are suitable for public ownership, that some of it was better off in the private sector. We need to have a way of classify it so we know which lands go into which kind of ownership wo that there was the matter of could be settled. Then I roughly sketched out this system of classification which marked the basis for seeing the new act.

HANS(?): How did that come about? The classification of the lands. You identified the need?

STODDARD: We had both sections of the staff with the Washington Office, State Directors (I won't say I invented it but I will say that I didn't stop it.) So, I had these maps, and I said, "You are clusters, here's some solid blocks and here are some scattered stuff, a forty-acre track in the middle of Bob Jones's father's ranch. That doesn't belong in public ownership." They told me there's nothing we could do about that, but they fit the definition of the criteria of public land status. The signs, the colors on the maps. Management plans, multiple use purposes, etc. Well, I had all that laid out. So, we went ahead and said this is what we're going to do is get this past the legislation. I didn't have any trouble, they were willing to go along with this idea of making it for five years, having a time limit on it. Because the public land law review commission was going to come along and solve all the problems.

NOT STODDARD: Do you think _____ had the idea that even though you had the CMU Act in place that you would be doing whatever you would that whatever was accomplished during those five years would just be wiped away by whatever new scheme the review commission passes?

STODDARD: That's just what happened. They didn't pay any attention to it. And here we had meeting with the local organizations' representatives from various types … We had hearing where they would make their pitch. The reason we did it is because there was more the {***usut***} the neat idea of trying to get lands classified. What was really behind our efforts was to get established once and for all the bullshit that was thrown around the West once the lands given back to private owners. We wanted to see if the people of the West wanted to slander or if they wanted the use of the land and not having to invest their money into it or pay taxes on it. This is what happened and _____ didn't like this. This is the finding of the CMU Act.

TAPE ENDED

NOT STODDARD: Let me see if I can understand this. Did make a deal to accept the Classification and Multiple Use Act so that he could get his Public Land Law Review Commission?

STODDARD: I don't think it was that clear, but I think it probably was. The Public Land Law Review Commission didn't get going until I was out. My working relationship with Wayne was pretty good, as a matter of fact, as soon as I was appointed to the job, he called me up person to person and said that he needed me to help him with a problem. He told me there was a wash in the Book Cliffs in Grand Junction. A small watership washed right down through the town into a residential area. And he wanted to know if we could go to , I said I wasn't familiar with the thing but I was going out there next week. The drive from Denver to Salt Lake City and I'll drive through Grand Junction, so I'll take a look at it. I talked to the District Manager, a guy named Miller, we went out to this and I asked him . What soil conservation measures were being taken. He said give him two years and he'd do it. So, he said I'll have the water stopped. There was an old cc dam lower into the water. They refurbished that. I went back two years later and here was a carpet of prairie flowers growing everywhere and the dam had backed up the water that was in it. Everything was a dream of a conservationist. was very pleased with that. I understand that all those houses have those redone from uranium.

NOT STODDARD: How did BLM get its first appropriation for recreation?

STODDARD: Well, there was the first thing Kennedy did there during the recession of the previous year or two and the thing that he did was set up an area for public works. There were a number of areas that were identified and put on maps of areas where people picnicked, came in with their campers, etc. So, we put in an application for some money and got it and put it to use in Montana and River, for Utah and other places that I don't remember. So, we got that pretty well going and put the whistle on us, told us that we're going to come in for an appropriation. It’s a temporary one. Then BLM set up another National Parks Service. We got too many ranchers out there needing this land. Why don't we sell it for park purposes? Set up the ARA. So, he didn't want us to do it. I swore on a stack of Bibles we weren't setting up a park service

but the people were using for recreational purposes. So that's how we got our first money. I promised them we weren't going to be another National Parks Service, but I didn't promise them we wouldn't go for more money.

NOT STODDARD: How did you go from that first kind of appropriation to a regular appropriation for recreation.

STODDARD: Just put it in there.

NOT STODDARD: You came to BLM, you decided you wanted to bring some new people with you for new ideas. One of the things you talked about was range, I'll just go over, and you can tell me if its correct. You went into range and one of your main concerns was range management and whether we were using a rotation system which you said the Washington Office said yes but when you went into the field, they said no. That is when you brought in Glen Folger because he had already been criticizing BLM range practices and you felt that his ideas were the Western economics. You decided wildlife has always been sort of the stepchild of the range program and you decided to elevate that by bringing in Mr. Bob Smith.

STODDARD: Yes (at various intervals throughout last paragraph), Bob Smith was the head of the Game and Fish Committee Department in Arizona.

NOT STODDARD: So it was at that time that we took wildlife out from underneath range and (Stoddard inturrupting: yes, yes, that's right).

STODDARD: I don't remember. That's asking for more detail than I can remember.

NOT STODDARD: We'll look that up. Some programs you felt were running fine, you mentioned that Ed was head of Forestry and that was going fine.

STODDARD: Yes. That was running as well as could be expected under the circumstances.

NOT STODDARD: What were those circumstances?

STODDARD: The appropriation for BLM's Forestry was based upon its marketing and timber. The office manager of budget insisted that we sell so much timber per year to get the money for the forestry. This would constitute a pressure for clearcutting and leaving tracks for the Timber Industry Association people passing for the expansion for the allowable cut. The Bureau went along with it because it meant more money to hire more foresters. We were programmed by it. The question was: Is this good forestry? They went in and they replanted the areas that were lost. In my opinion, they should use a group selection method, not wholesale type to make clear-cuts. This was a no-no as far as the timber association companies were concerned. They were just slaughtering the timber. Agencies like ours which should adhere to multiple use, conservation practices, to be a model, was just disaster. I'll never forget coming in Coos County. Came over the hill and there was this ownership valley just disaster. It was raining like hell and coming in the settlement off the road and into the stream, it makes you sick and your powerless to do anything about it. I was very sympathetic to their ideas about clearcutting over the tracks.

NOT STODDARD: Was that "passing creek" issue, that happened during your ten-year term? Where there was (cannot understand). and there was some kind of environmental disaster that had to do with the logging and timber?

STODDARD: That didn't happen while I was there. See, we laid the basis for the environmental blowup took place in '67 '69,

but it didn't take place while I was director. I mean the E day. Where there was an environmental protest, just a disastrous day.

NOT STODDARD: Just what kind of influence did environmental groups have with BLM at the time that you came in. They weren't quite as active as they were after you were there.

STODDARD: There wasn't as many of them, either. The one's that were significant are Simmon's Committee and Natural Resources, but they are no longer alive. The Isaac Walton Group, the National Wildlife Federation are still around.

NOT STODDARD: What were they trying to get you to do?

STODDARD: I had to get them to tell us what to do. See what I mean? I had to call them into my office to ask them to give us support on control over seismographic crews that were ripping up the plains states. Their exploration for oil ran bulldozers all over the place. We have pictures, I showed pictures to these guys, and we got regulation to control this worthless bulldozing. I called a meeting after the election was over in Denver that I hoped was with the oil companies, but it was with their contractors who took us. You know that regulation is with Adopt a [wild horse and burro???] is still floating around. I got Frank when he was a director. I talked to him about it and told him to get that regulation out of there. It's a stalemate. I asked Andrews to endorse it.

NOT STODDARD: Why do you think these conservation/environmental as crews were so standoffish because (1) the public didn't think of the public lands as valuable?

STODDARD: They were interested in them, but they didn't have any money. They had no money to take trips out to the West to see what was happening. They didn't have any identifiable

program that they could relate to. They didn't have lands in clusters like you do National Forests and National Parks.

NOT STODDARD: One thing we've noticed in the history is that issues continue to hop up, that no matter how much time passes the same issues keep raising their heads. This week BLM took a task on wild horses, is this still and issue.

STODDARD: Wild horse and [burro?] it was operating at a high level when I was there, you just learn to live with it. It's like, Pat Roberts is running for the Presidency, that kind of irrational person .

NOT STODDARD: What kind of problems did BLM face with wild horses during your ten years.

STODDARD: The same problems BLM has now, too many horses and not enough range.

NOT STODDARD: Well, what did you see as a solution?

STODDARD: Somebody take a wild horse down to the office and lose her. I would love to share that with Mr. , he feels that is one of his big failures: His inability to deal with the problem.

NOT STODDARD: It’s so emotional it’s a complex issue but unfortunately it becomes an issue where it becomes black and white, either you're good or bad.

STODDARD: Tell Mr. Burford when you're talking to him, reporting to him, that it would be nice to invite all of the old directors that are still around to come in and see the Bureau and to meet him.

NOT STODDARD: I think it would be an excellent idea.

STODDARD: It would give us a chance to relive a little history. And I think that writing this history might be the perfect occasion.

NOT STODDARD: Maybe the way the history comes out maybe we could . Of course, at the time the history comes out we'll be in transition the published text won't be out until December of '88.

STODDARD: That's time so it can become a campaign document. You do everything right after the election you don't release anything. What do we have down next?

NOT STODDARD: Land planning, I guess, or did you have something else in mind?

HANS: Well, we're going to talk to Bob Jones, and we have some background in how the planning shop.

NOT STODDARD: Is there anything you would like to say about the land planning effort, like where it was done?

STODDARD: I think there is need for defining multiple use, you have down here, what is that definition. I view it as being the application of the most technically appropriate conservation measures in the management of lands for sustained yields of grazing, timber, wildlife, water, and recreation in harmony with the natural ecosystems and within the carrying capacity of the resource. On rangelands, this means grazing within the carrying capacity of grass for production achieved by grass rotation, water spreading, receding water and other appropriate measures. On forest land, this means harvesting timber within the constraints of appropriate cultural systems applicable to the

forest type involved. With wildlife production kept within the constraints of the carrying capacity of the habitat for food cover, reproduction, and water. Water production: run off kept free of sediment or other public pollutants; watersheds adequately covered with vegetation. Recreational use is provided for without damaging the basic resources. You know the idea of multiple use of resources was adopted in 1960 with the forest service law and the purpose of it was to balance one pressure group of the heads of the others. That's the whole purpose of multiple use techniques; it was a technique by which the bureaucracy could play off the with one another. So, you have to take your choice on which one you want to use.

NOT STODDARD: It was interesting that only the forest service was successful in doing that. A lot of the people at the Bureau that we've talked to have said that because of these archistries {***(Note from typist: spelling of last word)***} BLM is more responsive and more democratic, truly involving its user groups whereas the forest service was in that mode of multiple use but BLM practices it more. BLM has a truer form of public participation in decision making. The forest service was thinking like: We'll hold our meeting and take our input but that is all we'll do.

(Speaker change, still not Stoddard)

They also made the comment that the forest service has its special use designations, which is their concept of multiple use whereas BLM does try to have multiple uses on the same track. Is that true?

STODDARD: That does describe the processes that are used in [allegation of] land uses. This defiance is for convenience purposes, not as constraints to uses that aren't compatible with harmonizing man's resource use with the productivity that he desires.

NOT STODDARD: Did you propose any other legislation that you saw active later, such as a quote "organic act"?

STODDARD: That's right.

NOT STODDARD: Let me follow up briefly on classification. Before the CMU act lands were classified under case matrix basis. Then the Classification and Multiple Use Act, how would you summarize what the Bureau did in terms of land classification, was there a plan to systematically and classify the land. Was there a plan to start or a plan on how it would be done?

STODDARD: Yes, there were meetings (in September of 1964) {***(typist note: did I miss anything here?)***} and Johnson signed it. The only items I can think of were meetings with Carver in December/January about putting together a draft for regulations. This is where Irving and I weren't on the same wavelength. It didn't fit his idea of what land planning should be and it didn't fit mine, either, of what the act provided for. So, we were running against two different definitions. We finally got something out anyway and tested it in the field and we tried to user mark 10 in all the district, and we had hearings, meetings, and there were all these groups working on this land in the Larm Hill near the Missouri River.

NOT STODDARD: But you were able to field test regulations.

STODDARD: Yes, we got the first ones set up as the retention areas. So, it was May of 1966 and went out in June. I got to see my baby come to pass.

NOT STODDARD: We've seen the National Land Reserve (saucer landing on table blocks out full hearing of what is said) and we've seen Land Natural Resource Lands.

It's the same thing. It was almost instead of saying public lands se called them National Land Reserve.

STODDARD: Yes, I think it was his invention.

NOT STODDARD: Was that a buzz word to make it sound like National Forest?

STODDARD: Yes, I suppose it was. I think that's the way this was.

NOT STODDARD: We talked a little about environmentalists, could you tell us a little more on what other pressure groups you had to deal with? Could you talk a little about livestock, timber, oil and gas, what their influence was from them?

STODDARD: Utah discovered uranium on the public land, filed its claim and got paid by the government to mine the uranium. Then the guy has the gall to come up and criticize the United States government for all the bad treatment he received. The son of a bitch should have been thrown out of court and I told him that in almost those exact word. It was at a wool growers meeting in Lake Tahoe, I said, "You have more nerve than anybody I have ever heard of." And I clicked this off, so it was fresh in my mind. I was full of righteous indignation.

NOT STODDARD: What had BLM done to him?

STODDARD: The slowness of the Panhandle Case. I can’t remember his name, but he was a well-known guy. He had a big house.

NOT STODDARD: When {***Gladden***} came in and started your new program on range, how did Stockman react? Was he leery?

STODDARD: No, they liked it. I didn't have any trouble getting along with Stockman at all. They liked it because we didn't cut back on the range, it didn't require fancy water. It must of been kind of how he presented it because I had expected some resistance. We weren't going to do it all at once we were going to try it on a ranch in each district. Get that and then get the bugs worked out.

NOT STODDARD: Was Udall's grazing fee issued? Udall tried to raise the grade of BLM by two dollars and some odd cents. Was that during your tenure or was that after you left?

STODDARD: That was me. That came about as a result of the directive. Johnson, during his campaign said that he was going to get fair market value out of Federal goods and services produced. So, the pressure came down, as usual from sources in the White House and the Secretary's Office to implement this list of things, and we went about doing that. So, we proposed the raise of the grazing fees in stages from the present fee which was 20 cents and was raised to 60 cents in increments of 5 cents per year. I didn't do anything about it until after the election. So, I called a meeting of the stockmen, who were lease holders, in Denver on the fifth of November (or the first day after the election) and I explained to them the problem we had with the President and what he wanted. So, the grazing fee seemed to be alright except we didn't give any indication about happiness when I stayed prepared with the private range fee charge. So, we went home and the next thing we know the White House issued a private memorandum essentially stating that the grazing fee was going to remain the same. I found out that Aspinall had gotten into the White House and had gotten some push overs to go along with it. That was the end of that. I think that was one fracas of .

NOT STODDARD: Because it was a significant jump in the grazing fee.

TAPE ENDED

NOT STODDARD: Let's step back a little bit when we were talking about the Mining Law of 1872, which you were trying to get changed. And the change was that you wanted them to file their mining claims. Because before {***Flippman***}[FLPMA], nobody had to file and

STODDARD: They would just pay the royalty fee. As the Land Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 required.

NOT STODDARD: But you were still going to let them go on and patent. Was this royalty only when it was at all.

STODDARD: I think it was, but I really don't remember.

HANS: But you have proposed changes in the Mining Law of '72.

STODDARD: I can't remember whether it went up beyond the Secretary's Office. I think Carver ditched it because he ditched everything that was politically courageous or necessary, but I can say that with full confidence.

NOT STODDARD: On Carver, you mentioned earlier that in the interview you said that Carver did not see eye to eye. Could you expand on that a little bit? What were the difference in philosophy?

STODDARD: They were very basic. Carver was a giveaway resource developer without any conservation compulsions.

NOT STODDARD: How could you have an under Secretary that was almost

STODDARD: Because he was appointed by the White House.

NOT STODDARD: Now where was Carver from?

STODDARD: Idaho. He was a from Frank Church's office. And I think that Church was anxious to see that Mr. Carver had a different environment of employment.

HANS: One of our questions was on the working relationship that you had with Carver.

STODDARD: He wanted to know why I accepted his appointment to BLM in spite of my feelings about the future of the job. I told that I would take it as long as I could report directly to him. Because the line of authority goes from me to the Assistant Secretary to the Secretary. I wanted to short circuit that because I told him frankly that I did not want to work for John Carver any way and that was the only reason I was holding up taking the appointment.

NOT STODDARD: Was that worked out or did you still have to go through Carver?

STODDARD: I couldn't get to Hugo sometimes I'd have to go through Carver. Carver would block me every chance he could. He was the one who was behind my appointment to getting to replace Carl [Karl Landstrom??] and he was the one who was behind my getting kicked out. I mean that's the kind of guy he was. He was doing it because he was the friend of Joe Miller, the lobbyist for the Western Forest Industries Associations that considers the ONC lands as private preserve and because of the proposal for point raise exchange for point raise lands for scattered, isolated, BLM public donated (not the ONC lands) because of that proposal being pushed by the WFIA was the reason for my getting shafted. Instead of Carver supporting that exchange, it was in the law that that exchange be handled. And I specifically sent forth instructions for getting the state director. The only scattered tracks outside of the blocks of ONC and public donated lands, only the scattered tracks would be

available for exchange. Then he lied about that. I said, real sweet, look over the lands that are available for exchange.

NOT STODDARD: If you don't mind, since we're on it, back up a little bit, maybe go into more detail on that, what is becoming known internally as a {***sweetswa***}. What were the lands being exchanged for?

[STODDARD?]: They are owned by a banker guy the name of Sweden, who lived in some town of southwestern Oregon. The question came up, he had an application for exchange his land on wide range for some public donated lands in Oregon. It was a test of the Classification/Multiple Use Act principles. The Western Forest Services Industries Association saw this as a reduction in the allowable cut because his public owned lands were pulled in with the ONC lands in figuring an allowable cut. That's one of the things that Carl Anderson was holding up from going through and Carver wanted it to go through because Carver was working for the Western Forest Industries Association. I say that with my tongue in my cheek because he was the one who was pushing it and he with the work of Joe Miller, who was their lobbyist in Washington, to get this new calculation of increasingly allowable cut by increasing their resource base. The result was that I wouldn't give, and Carver wouldn't give and Carver had more authority than I did so I asked Hugo to clear the end of my tenure with BLM because I did not want to get involved with it. What I'm telling you is information I got from Warren Beaty which is Stewart [Udall’s??] 's Administrative Assistant.

HANS: I think we've gotten everything in terms of the BLM questions. I'm kind of interested in how you think BLM is now and what you've done since you left BLM.

STODDARD: Until BLM gets a continuity of tender, confidence that their lands will remain in public ownership, that the future of the Bureau is in question. Read that any way you want to, but there is no assurance of its

JIM: You don't think the intention statement in the Federal Land Policy and Management Act [FLPMA] is strong enough because of those lands that are good for other purposes can go out of BLM.

STODDARD: It doesn't set a clear set of criteria of what stays in Federal ownership and what goes out. Or any system for determining what should be retained and what should be disposed.

JIM: Like CMU did in '64.

HANS: Ron Hofman had a very interesting conclusion in that he felt BLM really needed a multiple use constituency and that BLM is buffed constantly by all of these single use organizations. They have consistently, especially in the '70s and '80s, sued for their one point of view and that BLM is hampered by its lack of constituency believing in multiple use. Would you agree with that assessment?

STODDARD: I don't see how you can get a constituency that believes in multiple use, though.

JIM: You're not the first one to say so and I personally have that feeling.

STODDARD: This is the intent to provide of resources to user groups without destroying the quality of the resource or its productivity, but you get a Western Forest Industries Association that stands over a Bureau and its paranoid State Director and insists on clearcutting whole stream basins and no support for the director who is trying to force the kind of practices that need to be adopted you've got a mess.

JIM: Do you feel that that is a problem with the Bureau maybe is too decentralized.

STODDARD: No, no, the Bureau is too politicized.

HANS: And you see that as still true.

STODDARD: I came up the political and professional ladder and I wasn't able to get the support out of the Secretary.

JIM: As long as were here on this politicized question, what is the difference between the Forest Service on this issue and why are they different?

STODDARD: The Bureau and the Forest Service were the ones that led the way towards massive clear cuts and Cliff, no longer with us, was the chief of the Forest Service. He led the way toward massive clear-cuts in the early sixties. Up until then, the Forest Service was a ly sound agency. Ed Cliff may have been persuaded in a little ranch house in Oregon high in the mountains near the Three Sisters. Which is maintained by the rather large number of companies to entertain their clients and for the water . Ed was not a guy who had a reputation for standing off special interest groups; he was easily persuaded to change the method of harvesting timber. Once the chief of the Forest Service has made a decision it ripples on down through the rest of the organization. So, they yielded from the pressure of their own organization, and not from the lumbermen who're pressing on their chief. So, the guy down below is the one who's making the decision. I didn't make any decision on clearcutting, but I was in the process of making a decision of reduce of stopping the increase in the allowable cut which was proposed by Oregon right when this wheat thing was going on. They wanted to increase the allowable cut by reducing the diameter of the trees that were growing in a circular stance, reduce them from 24 [inches] to like 18 inches or something like that. That was for the allowable cut and I was resisting that; meanwhile, Cliff had gone along in approving clearcutting. He had a Scandinavian name of the guy in Oregon who had done the calculations. I had studied Forest Management under Donald Matthews, the guy who wrote the book and I know where to call when you're asking questions. {***(didn't

hear this sentence)***} had off and he changed the allowable cut.

JIM: I have just one last question. We talked about your papers (this is for future researchers): Are you planning to place your papers someplace someday? Perhaps donate them to the Forest History Society or the University of Michigan?

STODDARD: I have to, some of them are at the Minnesota State Historical Society. I just gave them big, big boxes of them. They've never done anything with them that I know of, in the six or eight years since I gave them to them. I've got a bunch of papers I'd be glad to donate to anybody who wants to take them.

JIM: Well, if you ever decide to where you're going to put them, we'd like to know.

STODDARD: Do you know of any place that would like to have them?

JIM: A number of the ex-directors, because of their forestry background, looked at the Forest History Society down in Durham. {***Closses(?)***}, Boyd Rasmussen said that he will be giving his papers to them. That may be well; unfortunately, BLM doesn't have any way of holding them, and the National Archives don't do that anymore for us in terms of the Bureau heads. There is no "Public Land History Society" or anything like that so Forest History in many respects seems logical but since you have some at Minnesota that always helps to have your collection in one place.

END OF DICTATION